



JUL 09 2007

Customized PTO/SB/21 (04-07)

## TRANSMITTAL FORM

(for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total number of pages in this submission =

Application #	10/566,242
Confirmation #	3423
Filing Date	January 30, 2006
First Inventor	HUMAN
Art Unit	1732
Examiner	McDowell, Suzanne E.
Docket #	P08831US00/DEJ

## ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fees calculated below              | <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Response to Restriction | <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> including Attachment(s)            | <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> After Final Amendment/Reply        | <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> including Attachment(s)            | <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Petition         | <input type="checkbox"/>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>                                    | <input type="checkbox"/>   |

## FEES CALCULATION: For claims if required and/or other fees as shown below:

	NOW	Previously Paid For	Present Extra	Rate	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> TOTAL CLAIMS	17	- 20		X \$ 50 =	
<input type="checkbox"/> INDEPENDENT CLAIMS	4	- 4		X \$ 200 =	
TOTAL OF ABOVE CLAIMS FEES =					
<input type="checkbox"/> Reduction by ½ for small entity status of applicant					SUBTOTAL =
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee for extension of time (per attached Petition)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Other fee for					
TOTAL OF ALL FEES =					<input type="text"/>

Payment by credit card. FORM PTO-2038 in the amount of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ is attached.

- The Director is authorized to charge any fee, additional fee or extension fee due in connection herewith to Deposit Account No. 12-0555:
- (1) if no payment or an insufficient payment is enclosed and a fee is due in connection herewith; or  
(2) if no petition for extension of time is enclosed but an EOT is required - and in this event, applicant hereby petitions under 37 CFR 1.136(a) for an extension of time of as many months as are required to render this submission timely.

Date: July 9, 2007

By: Douglas E. Jackson

Registration No.: 28,518

STITES & HARBISON PLLC • 1199 North Fairfax St. • Suite 900 • Alexandria, VA 22314  
TEL: 703-739-4900 • FAX: 703-739-9577 • Customer No. 00881



**RESPONSE TO  
RESTRICTION**

Application #	10/566,242
Confirmation #	3423
Filing Date	January 30, 2006
First Inventor	HUMAN
Art Unit	1732
Examiner	McDowell, Suzanne E.
Docket #	P08831US00/DEJ

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SIR:

In response to the second restriction requirement contained in the Office Action dated June 15, 2007, Applicant hereby traverses the restriction requirement.

In the Action, the examiner has quoted MPEP §806.05(j) in support of the restriction requirement. However, as this is a national stage application (filed under 35 USC § 371), the PCT standard under PCT Rule 13.1 (as cited in the previous restriction requirement) is the proper standard - see MPEP § 801, § 802, § 1850, § 1893.03(d) and § 1896.

As noted in the previous restriction requirement, this standard is whether the inventions are "so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity of invention")". In the international stage of this national application, and in the previous restriction requirement, unity of invention of claims 1-14 was found (and see in the previous restriction requirement the special technical features common to claims 1-14 as recited therein on page 2, the next to last "bullet").

Therefore, claims 1-14 of this national stage application have unity of invention and this national stage application is entitled to have both sets of method claims examined. For these reasons, withdrawal of this restriction requirement and

examination of all claims 1-14 is thus solicited.

As the reply to a restriction requirement must also contain a responsive election even when the restriction requirement is traversed, applicant hereby elects method claims 1-10 with the traverse as noted above.

Further and favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 9, 2007

Douglas E. Jackson  
By: Douglas E. Jackson  
Registration No.: 28,518

**STITES & HARBISON PLLC** ♦ 1199 North Fairfax St. ♦ Suite 900 ♦ Alexandria, VA 22314  
TEL: 703-739-4900 ♦ FAX: 703-739-9577 ♦ CUSTOMER No. 00881